

## REMARKS

The examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slipy in view of Barnes.

The rejections of independent claims 9, 12, and 17 are traversed. Claim 9 is specifically for a digital audio player. But both Slipy and Barnes teach telephones. The examiner has not met his burden of showing a suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of Slipy and Barnes to apply to a digital audio player. In fact, the rejection of claim 12 never even mentions a digital audio player. See Paper No. 021306, pages 2-3. Thus, the examiner has not met his burden of showing *prima facie* obviousness.

Turning to the method of claim 12, an electronic device with a base having a first surface is manufactured to accept an ornamental insert on the base first surface. Slipy does not teach a replaceable ornamental insert. *Id.* And the decorative appliqué of Barnes is either attached to the underside of the faceplate, fit within a slot of a transparent faceplate, or is sandwiched between two half-sections of a faceplate. See Figures 2-4; column 4, lines 4-5, 24-25, and 66-68. Thus, Barnes fails to teach that a base of his telephone is manufactured to accept the appliqué; rather, the appliqué is associated with the face plate, and in one embodiment sandwiched between two halves of a faceplate. Clearly, this embodiment teaches away from acceptance by a phone base.

With respect to claim 17, the faceplate covers all of the upper surface of the base of an electronic device. Neither Slipy nor Barnes teaches a faceplate that covers all of the upper surface. For example, both Slipy and Barnes have cut out portions in their faceplates. See, e.g., Figures 2 and 2-4 respectively. In contrast, in an embodiment of the present invention, a faceplate may cover all of the upper surface such as the upper surface of a notebook computer's display housing.

Because neither Slipy nor Barnes, nor a combination thereof teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 9, 12, and 17, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established for these claims or claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an ornamental insert punched out of a sheet of paper after a user of the electronic device has printed an ornamental design thereon. Neither Slipy nor Barnes teaches such a thing. Namely, Barnes discloses that his appliqué may be made of paper, but Barnes does not teach that the appliqué may be made by the telephone's

user by printing a design on a piece of paper such as at his or her home or office and punching the out of the paper such as by perforations or the like. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are patentably distinguished over the combination of Slipy and Barnes. Reconsideration is requested.


## CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0624US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 30, 2006



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906

Attorneys for Intel Corporation